Attorney's Docket No.: 14012-050001/50-03-029

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Douglas R. Sangunetti Art Unit: 3664

Serial No.: 10/726,278 Examiner: Jonathan A. Goldfarb

Filed : December 2, 2003 Conf. No. : 3378

Title : A BOUNDARY DETECTION ALGORITHM FOR EMBEDDED DEVICES

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Responsive to the action mailed January 10, 2008, Applicant elects the invention of Group I, Claims 1-27 and 36-40, drawn to methods for detecting a boundary crossing. This election is made without traverse. Applicant elects Embodiment 4 of Genus III in response to the requirement to elect a species. This election is made with traverse. In particular, the restriction requirement asserts that the species are mutually exclusive in nature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes, for example, that embodiment I of Genus III (determining a distance covered within a jurisdiction defined by the boundary), embodiment 2 of Genus III (determining an amount of fuel used within a jurisdiction defined by a boundary), embodiment 3 of Genus III (determining statistics related to a jurisdiction defined by the boundary), and embodiment 4 of Genus III (retrieving adjacent jurisdiction boundary data when a boundary crossing is indicated, with the adjacent jurisdiction boundary data defining rectangles associated with a boundary of an adjacent jurisdiction that is occupied after a boundary crossing) are not mutually exclusive. In fact, it is possible to implement a single embodiment that performs the operations of all four of the identified embodiments. Thus, the identified species are not mutually exclusive and Applicant respectfully requests that the species election be withdrawn